

COMMUNITY AND IDENTITY IN CASTILIAN HISTORIES OF THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY

Darcy Kern*

Communal identity and political legitimacy are among the most consistent and problematic themes in human history. What is a community? Does it define itself in terms of geography, ethnicity, language, religion, citizenship, or political dominion? How do others define it? How do those in positions of authority secure their legitimacy? These are difficult questions. History has long offered people a means of answering them. Both written history and visual depictions of history have the power to transmit to contemporaries and posterity stories of people, places, and events that authors, artists, and patrons believe worthy of remembrance. In the fifteenth century history was as important to the construction of communal identity and political legitimacy as it is today, and in the kingdoms of Spain just as fraught. How, then, did Catholic Castilians portray the history of al-Andalus and its peoples in relation to Castilian history during the period in which they absorbed much of the Muslim population of southern Iberia?

The work of Richard Kagan, Ana Echevarría, Peter Linehan, and Ron Barkai provides a starting point for answering this question. While Linehan wrote about the development of Castilian histories from the seventh to the fourteenth centuries, arguing that historians in each age distorted the past for present purposes, Barkai wrote about the entrenchment of a “mentality of hostility” between Christians and Muslims who reflected each other in the High Middle Ages¹. Barkai argued that more research needs to be done on this “mentality” in the Late Middle Ages², which is where Echevarría’s work is situated. She studied four fifteenth-century Castilian Christian intellectuals and writers—Juan de Segovia, Juan de Torquemada, Pedro de la Cavallería, and Alonso de Espina— and their depiction of Iberian Muslims, known as Moors generally or Mudejars if living un-

* Southern Connecticut State University (USA).

1. Peter Linehan, *History and the Historians of Medieval Spain* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 4; Ron Barkai, *El enemigo en el espejo: Cristianos y Musulmanes en la España medieval* (Madrid: Rialp, 2007), 11.
2. Barkai, *El enemigo en el espejo*, 269.

der Christian rule, concluding that their hostility towards Moors stimulated the final push to conquer the Muslim kingdom of Granada³. Echevarría writes, "The perception Christian writers in the Iberian Peninsula had of the Muslim community surrounding them, both within the Christian territories and in neighboring Granada, is one of the most interesting aspects of the last years of the Reconquest"⁴. It was, as she shows, also one of the most consequential politically and ideologically. Finally, Kagan examined royal chroniclers and their depiction of *historia pro patria* (history centered on the achievements of the kingdom as a whole) and *historia pro persona* (personalized, king-centered histories) in the late medieval and early modern period, arguing briefly that *historia pro patria* had dominated Castilian-Leonese histories of the High Middle Ages, but *historia pro persona* superseded it in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries⁵.

In contrast to the authors Echevarría analyzed, fifteenth-century chroniclers and biographers were not always hostile to the Moors in their histories. Rather, they often seem unsure of the Moors' precise status in Iberia. All agreed with Castilian Christian political control or overlordship, but few had a clear idea of the implications of that lordship for the Moors. Should Moors be allowed to remain as part of the community (that is, as Mudejars) once a Castilian Christian monarch took control of their town, region, or kingdom, or was there no possibility of them belonging? Rodrigo Sánchez de Arévalo (1404-1470), Fernán Pérez de Guzmán (c. 1377-c. 1460), Alonso Fernández de Palencia (1423-1492), Hernando de Pulgar (1436-c. 1492), and Mosén Diego de Valera (1412-1488), all of whom served the Crown or nobility in some capacity, gave different answers. Valera wrote the most popular history of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and the first chronicle printed in Castile, the *Crónica abreviada de España*, sometimes called the *Valeriana*⁶. A knight in the service of Juan II (r. 1406-1454) and a diplomat for three successive monarchs, he was one of the most prolific writers in fifteenth-century Iberia, and one who believed that the war against the kingdom of Granada should be a priority for Castile. Though Juan II and Enrique IV (r. 1454-1474) had failed to fight this war in any meaningful way, Valera hoped Isa-

3. Ana Echevarría, *The Fortress of Faith: The Attitude Towards Muslims in Fifteenth Century Spain* (Boston: Brill, 1999), 4-5. For more on Mudejars, see Francisco Márquez Villanueva, "On the Concept of Mudejarism", in *The Conversos and Moriscos in Late Medieval Spain and Beyond, Volume One: Departures and Change*, ed. Kevin Ingram (Boston: Brill, 2009), 23-49.

4. Echevarría, *The Fortress of Faith*, 1.

5. Richard Kagan, *Clio and the Crown: The Politics of History in Medieval and Early Modern Spain* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009), 14, 27-29. Kagan also describes *pro persona* as "individualized royal chronicles focused on the achievements of a single reign".

6. Valera's chronicle was printed in 1482, 1487, 1489, 1491, 1492, 1493 (twice), 1495, 1499, 1500, 1513, 1517, and more until 1567, when the last edition before the modern era appeared. The text is divided into four parts: the cosmography of the world, the population of "las españas", the coming of the Goths to the Spains, and Pelayo to Valera's present. Mosén Diego de Valera, *Crónica abreviada de España* (Sevilla: Jacopo Cromberger, 1517), f. iv. I am using Beinecke Library DP74 V3 1517+ Oversize.

bel and Ferdinand would see it through to completion⁷. He therefore dedicated his *Crónica* to the queen⁸. Palencia and Pulgar, like Valera, were diplomats, the former to Rome for Juan II, the latter to France for Enrique IV. Pulgar also served as royal historiographer to Queen Isabel (r. 1474-1504). Palencia wrote a history of the reigns of Juan II, Enrique IV and Isabel entitled *Gesta Hispaniensia ex analibus suorum diebus colligentis* (shortened to the Livy-esque *Décadas*). It was translated into Spanish as the *Crónica de Enrique IV* shortly after it appeared⁹. Between 1489 and 1492 Palencia also wrote a history of the war against Granada. Arévalo, bishop of Palencia, served as secretary to and ambassador for Enrique IV. His *Compendiosa historia Hispánica*, written in Latin, appeared in print in Rome in 1470. Guzmán, a humanist, worked for the powerful Mendoza family. His *Generaciones y Semblanzas* served as the exemplar for Pulgar's later *Claros varones de España* (Toledo: 1486). All of these men thus lived and served during the tumultuous reigns of Juan II and Enrique IV, when these indecisive kings were dominated by favorites. Those who lived past 1474 wrote positively about the strength and stability Isabel and her husband Ferdinand brought to royal government.

Hispania, as the Romans called the Iberian Peninsula, had been more or less politically united under Roman and Visigothic control, though there were obviously areas, such as the central north / west side of the Pyrenees mountains where state power was weak or ineffective. According to Valera, when the Romans entered Iberia, they were invaders whom "the Spanish" (*los españoles*) resisted¹⁰. Valera concentrated on the history of the Roman Republic and its engagement with Iberia, particularly during its struggle with Carthage, and did not mention the most famous Roman emperors –Trajan and Hadrian– from Hispania, instead moving on to the Visigoths, the Germanic tribe that invaded Iberia and established a kingdom in the wake of the Roman Empire's collapse in the fifth century. The Visigoth kingdom itself collapsed in 711, when an army of Arab and Berber Muslims crossed the Straits of Gibraltar and successfully subdued most of the cities of the peninsula. Iberia subsequently split into multiple kingdoms, counties, and an emirate. The latter became a caliphate in the tenth century, then broke apart into numerous *taifa*, or petty, kingdoms in the

7. Cristina Moya García, "La producción historiográfica de Mosén Diego de Valera en la Época de los Reyes Católicos", in *La literatura en la Época de los Reyes Católicos*, eds. Nicasio Salvador Miguel and Cristina Moya García (Madrid: Iberoamericana, 2008), 145-166, at 145, 147.

8. He wrote the text while serving as *corregidor* of Segovia for eleven months from 1479-1480 after a riot broke out there among New Christians (*conversos*). Marvin Lunenfeld, *Keepers of the City: The Corregidores of Isabella I of Castile (1474-1504)* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 138. Valera, Palencia and Pulgar were from *converso* backgrounds.

9. The Biblioteca Nacional de España has numerous sixteenth-century manuscripts of this text in Spanish.

10. Valera, *Crónica abreviada de España*, f. 21v. Some, such as Juan de Valdés, did not accept much of the history in Valera's chronicle. For more, see Cristina Moya García, "La suerte de la Valeriana, 1482-1567", in *Mosén Diego de Valera entre las armas y las letras*, ed. Cristina Moya García (Rochester, NY: Tamesis, 2014), 103-124, at 103-104.

eleventh century. In the north, the political configuration constantly shifted, as kingdoms and counties grew, combined, separated, and repeated the process. By the fifteenth century two Christian kingdoms, Castile-León and Aragón, dominated central and eastern Iberia. Both sought hegemony in the peninsula and beyond, but how were they to determine hegemonic legitimacy? Castilians seem to have had a two-fold answer to this problem, which led them to write history as an inextricable mix of *pro patria* and *pro persona*. First, they wanted to see Hispania reunited under the control of one government –in the language of the time, *las Españas* under a *rey de España*. Second, they believed that Castile-León had the best claim to political control of the peninsula. It possessed the shrine of St. James at Santiago de Compostela, but more than that, it possessed the city of Toledo and all the other trappings of Visigoth Spain as well as a lineage connecting pre-Muslim Hispania to the present as Arévalo observed¹¹.

Following Isidore of Seville's seventh century example, nearly all Castilian histories began with the Visigoths, who had established their capital at Toledo during the reign of Leovigild (568-586)¹². The city had been lost to the Muslims in 711, but in 1085 Alfonso VI, king of Castile-León, recaptured the city from al-Qadir, the *taifa* king of Toledo. At the Council of Basel in 1434, Alonso de Cartagena (1384-1456), canon of Burgos, argued that his king, Juan II (r. 1406-1454), was the territorial heir to Leovigild because he possessed Toledo. Thus, Castile was the heir to the Visigothic kings and the Castilian delegation at Basel represented all of Spain. This lineage made Castile older and of higher precedence than other countries such as England, with whose delegation Cartagena was arguing at the time¹³. By linking fifteenth-century territorial claims to those of the Visigoths, Valera, Arévalo and Cartagena could claim a heritage that predated the Muslim invasion of 711, thereby giving themselves a historic legitimacy of first right, so to speak, to territory and land. However, such treatments of Visigoth history were cursory at best. Visigoth history was not something to dwell on but rather a means to an end, a passing acknowledgment of previous political validity in order for Christians, especially Castilian Christians, to control the entire peninsula and "prove" their preeminence over other monarchs in Iberia and throughout Europe.

11. Rodrigo Sánchez de Arévalo, *Compendiosa historia hispánica* (Rome: Udalricus Gallus, 1470), 25-27. I am here citing Beinecke Zi +3348A.

12. On Isidore as a writer and historian, see Jamie Wood, *The Politics of Identity in Visigothic Spain: Religion and Power in the Histories of Isidore of Seville* (Boston: Brill, 2012).

13. Luciano Serrano, *Los conversos, d. Pablo de Santa María y d. Alfonso de Cartagena, obispos de Burgos, gobernantes, diplomáticos y escritores* (Madrid: C. Bermejo, 1942), 140-143. Cartagena also argued that Castilian cities were larger and more numerous than their English counterparts; that Castile had been evangelized by St. James the Apostle, whose shrine was at Compostela; and that their role in the Reconquest was of greater consequence to the Church. Kagan observes that a century later Pedro de Alcocer's *Historia o descripción de la Imperial ciudad de Toledo* (1551) sought to remind the future Philip II (r. 1556-1598) of the city's historic importance so that he would establish his capital there, which he did from 1559-1561 before moving it to Madrid. Kagan, *Clio and the Crown*, ix.

The figure of Pelayo, who resisted the Muslims at the battle of Covadonga in 722, was also central to Castilian claims of political hegemony. Arévalo, like Alonso de Cartagena, argued that the Visigoths were kings of all Spain¹⁴. The Muslim invasion had not broken the line of Iberian Gothic kings, which began with Theodoric (r. 418-451), whom Arévalo labeled the first *rex Gothorum in Hispania regnante*, and continued through Pelayo in Asturias after 711¹⁵. Through Pelayo legitimate political control of the peninsula descended directly to the kings of Castile-León¹⁶. Arévalo distinguished between those he labeled the “kings of the Goths in Spain”, who had originated in and ultimately belonged to the province of Dacia, and Pelayo and his successors in Asturias, who, though Gothic, first held the title “king of Spain” and whose kingdom ultimately grew to become Castile-León¹⁷. Thus, in his own day, Enrique IV “reigned gloriously in his illustrious kingdoms of Castile and Leon, principal monarch of the Spains”¹⁸. Palencia observed that though the Moors broke the “ancient power of the Goths” (*el antiguo poderío de los godos*) when they invaded, their “devastation” of the Gothic kingdom stopped when Pelayo, “last scion of the most noble Gothic families” (*último vástago de las más nobles familias godas*), successfully defended Asturias. Pelayo’s warlike ardor continued to enflame the hearts “of his successors”, by which Palencia meant “the Christians of Asturias, Vascongadas, and Cantabria”¹⁹. Thus, the Gothic lineage was important because it provided a political, royal, and institutional link to a pre-Moorish past.

Valera, in contrast, did not explicitly link Pelayo’s personal history to the Gothic nobility. Instead, he wrote that Pelayo was Cantabrian. Nor did he refer to the Goths as “Christians” or “Spaniards”, preferring “Goths” instead when describing the last Gothic king, “in whose time the Spains were lost” (*en cuyo tiempo las españas se perdieron*)²⁰. He was clear that those who fled north in 711

14. On Cartagena and Arévalo, see Rodrigo Sánchez de Arévalo, *Tratado sobre la división del reino y cuándo es lícita la primogenitura*, ed. Jesús Ángel Solórzano Telechea, trans. José Carlos Miralles Maldonado (Logroño: Instituto de Estudios Riojanos, 2011), 24-26, 49-50.

15. Arévalo, *Compendiosa historia hispánica*, 31.

16. Arévalo, *Compendiosa historia hispánica*, 25. “Rex vero ipse Castelle Henrricus quartus modernus ab Athanarico ex Gothis primo regnante per ordinatas successiones descendit... Pelagio qui primus regnavit post cladem in Hispania”.

17. Arévalo, *Compendiosa historia hispánica*, 43.

18. Rodrigo Sánchez de Arévalo, *Suma de la Política*, ed. Juan Beneyto Perez (Madrid: Instituto Francisco de Vitoria, 1944), 31. “El rey don Enrrique el quarto, reynante gloriosamente en los sus ínclitos reynos de Castilla e de León, principal monarca de las Espannas”.

19. Alonso Fernández de Palencia, *Anales de la Guerra de Granada*, trans. A. Paz y Meliá (Madrid: Tip. de la Revista de Archivos, 1909), 9.

20. Valera, *Crónica de España*, f. 33r-34r. In a letter to Alfonso de Velasco in May 1475, Valera wrote that “after the universal destruction of Spain [España]” in 711, the kings of France took precedence over those “of our Castile”, which was a reversal of the original order “in the time of the glorious kings of Spain”. He blamed the destruction on the sins of several Gothic kings. *Epístolas de Mosén Diego de Valera*, ed. José Antonio de Balenchana (Madrid: Miguel Ginesta, 1878), 25.

sought refuge with Pelayo in the mountains of Asturias and together with the Asturians and Cantabrians they had made Pelayo king of Spain (*lo alçaron por rey de españa*)²¹. As the chosen king of Spain, he held dominion over all the many peoples in the cities and towns the Muslims had conquered in “the Spains” (*fue elegido por rey de diversas gentes de todas las ciudades y villas que los moros ganaron en las Españas*), even though he actually possessed few of them²². Possession may be 9/10s of the law, but the *idea* of possession and the rituals confirming the idea, in this case election and writing history, provided the necessary 1/10 that, according to Valera, legitimized conquest and control. Castile-León, then, was a Christian community with an ancient pedigree that continued to exist, albeit in much diminished and slightly different form, after the Muslim invasion of 711.

The visual symbols Castilian kings commissioned and used during their wars with the Moors further identified them with resistance to the Muslim invasion of Iberia. In the Alcázar of Segovia, where Enrique IV was raised and Isabel became queen, a series of gilded polychrome wooden statues encircled the frieze of the Sala de los Reyes. These statues depict the unbroken line of Castilian-Leonese kings from Pelayo on, each seated on a throne and holding a scepter, an orb, or a sword. They provided visual representation of royal legitimacy. The royal circle began with Pelayo and initially stopped at Fernando III, father of Alfonso X (r. 1252-1284), who had commissioned the series when he rebuilt the Sala de los Reyes to host meetings of the Cortes after part of the Alcázar collapsed in 1258. Enrique IV renovated the room in the mid-fifteenth century and furthered the series of royal statues to include all kings to his reign inclusive. More than a century later, Felipe II (r. 1556-1598) commissioned several sculptors and painters to finish the series with Isabel and her daughter Juana (r. 1504-1520 effectively), Felipe’s great-grandmother and grandmother, respectively. Juana sits between her mother Isabel and Pelayo, thus completing the circle²³. This iconography served as a visual reminder of the unbroken succession of kings and queens from the eighth century to the present and told in artistic form the same story that historians told in their texts.

While Pelayo legitimized the martial vigor and royal rule of Castilian kings, Isidore, whom many writers imitated, religiously and rhetorically linked the fifteenth century to the Gothic, pre-Muslim past. Guzmán wrote, “The kings of Castile had a custom of old, that when they entered into war with the Moors, they always carried on their person a pendant of Saint Isidore of León”²⁴. Saint

21. Valera, *Crónica de España*, f. 34v.

22. Valera, *Crónica de España*, f. 35r.

23. María Cruz López Orcajo, *El Alcázar de Segovia en los siglos XVI y XVII* (Segovia: Obra Cultural de la Caja de Ahorros y Monte de Piedad de Segovia, 1980), 18-19, 63-64.

24. Fernán Pérez de Guzmán, *Cosas Sacadas de la Historia del Rey Don Juan Segundo: BL MS Egerton 1875*, eds. Angus MacKay and Dorothy Sherman Severin (Exeter: University of Exeter, 1981), 5. “Los reyes de Castilla antiguamente avían por costumbre que, quando entravan en guerra de moros, por sus personas levavan siempre consigo el pendón de San Isidro de León”.

Isidore, of course, was archbishop of Seville in the seventh century and is associated today with the Andalusian city, but in the eleventh century, Fernando I of León (r. 1056-1065) sent an embassy to al-Mu'tadid, *taifa* king of Seville (r. 1042-1069), and acquired the saint's remains, which he reinterred in the new Basilica of San Isidro in the northern city of León. From the eleventh century on, then, he was called Saint Isidore of León, and his name and presence gave religious and political legitimacy to the northern kings in their wars against the south.

Possession of the city of Toledo and the historic figures of Pelayo and Isidore thus allowed Castilians to frame a historical narrative with an unbroken link between the Christian Visigothic kingdom and Castilian Christian claims to political legitimacy and dominion over the peninsula. The events of 711 and the subsequent establishment of political societies in al-Andalus had not eradicated but simply hindered the full flowering of Christian dominion. However, the issue of the Moors' status in Hispania remained. By the fifteenth century the Moors had lived in the peninsula for seven hundred years, developed deep ties to the people and land, and created a rich, historic culture. If, as Arévalo wrote, cities and communities are founded and ordered towards good ends, including living well and virtuously, living sufficiently in peace and security, conducting commerce and exchange, and marrying, was it possible for a mixed religious community to exist?²⁵

Authors addressed this matter differently, depending on the type of history they were writing. Palencia's *Crónica de Enrique IV* focuses primarily on the war between Castile and Portugal over the succession to the Castilian throne, but on a few occasions Palencia mentions Granada and Morocco. In general, in these instances his tone is straightforward, referring to Enrique IV's expeditions against the Moors of Granada, the arrival at court of some Granadan nobles, and the political customs of the kingdom. At one point, though, he offered a lengthy morality tale on the election of Granadan kings and the requirement that "they govern with prudence and valor". Unfortunately, because their opulence and wealth led to carelessness, many of them met disastrous ends. Granada, Palencia observed, was "the community in which the throne is most unstable", but this worked to Castile's advantage because Juan II was able to "recover" territory in Andalusia. Palencia seemed unsure, though, of whether the Moors could be part of Hispania. He noted that in many instances, "Catholic kings had sheltered and given aid to Moorish fugitives" and that Moorish kings had done the same for "Catholic nobles". At the same time he referred to the Moors as "the enemy race" and proceeded to castigate Enrique IV for not taking advantage of the instability in Granada to capture the kingdom²⁶. Palencia's *Guerra de Granada* was antagonistic by its very nature. In it he concluded that the Moors had never belonged to Spain. They were barbarian invaders (*bárbaros invasores*),

25. Arévalo, *Suma de la Política*, 39. Arévalo is citing Aristotle here.

26. Alonso de Palencia, *Crónica de Enrique IV*, trans. A. Paz y Meliá (Madrid: Atlas, 1975), 67-69.

a ferocious (*feroz*), savage (*salvaje*) people. The Christians, united “by a religious chain” (*por vínculo religioso*), slowly defeated them and reclaimed territory²⁷. Palencia sometimes used the term “Christians” to refer to the northern peoples and kingdoms and “Muslims” (*musulmanes*) to refer to those who invaded in 711 and fought Pelayo. At other times he used the term “Spaniards” for the Christian kingdoms and “Granadans” (*granadinos*) for the Muslim kingdom in the fifteenth century. For example, he writes that “Spaniards” (*los españoles*) recovered Cádiz in the time of Enrique IV and explains the various means through which Isabel and Ferdinand justified their war against “the Granadans”. Use of the term Christians to denote those in the north or the northern kingdoms is obviously exclusionary and overlooks the Jews and Mudejars who lived among them, but it does mark a perceptible, factual difference between those who lived in Iberia prior to 711 and those who arrived in that year. The shift to the term “Spaniards” in an exclusionary sense, however, suggests several things to the reader. First, that “Spain” and “Castile” are interchangeable for Palencia. Second, that Muslim Granadans were not Spaniards in spite of the longevity of their presence in Hispania²⁸. Guzmán argued likewise, that Spain and Castile were interchangeable and that the Moors did not belong. Both the Gothic loss of “Spain” to the Muslims and the contemporary existence of the kingdom of Granada, which “not only defends itself against Spain, but offends it”, were grave problems for the peninsula. “The sins of Castile”, he wrote, had prolonged the war in the south and delayed the return of “Spain to her ancient possession, expelling the Moors from it and restoring it to the Christians”²⁹. Thus, for these authors, especially Guzmán and Palencia, no Muslim political entity could legitimately exist in Iberia, nor for Guzmán could individual Moors belong to the community of Spain.

Arévalo’s exclusion of Iberian Moors from Hispania was not as clear as Guzmán’s. He variously labeled Moors “infidels” (*infideles*), “mohammedans” (*mahometes*), “enemies” (*hostium*), and, most commonly, “Saracens” (*sarraceni* / *sarracenos*). He observed that in 1079 Alfonso VI sent Rodrigo Díaz de Vivar, more commonly known as El Cid, to al-Mu’tamid, the *taifa* king of Seville (r. 1069-1091), to collect tribute. While there, Díaz had to fight the king of Granada, who had many Christian exiles from “Hispania” helping him³⁰. Yet Arévalo later included Granada, *quam* Granada, in his list of Iberian kingdoms subject to Castilian dominion instead of distinguishing between Granadans and Spaniards and recommending the total destruction of the former, as Palencia and Guzmán

27. Palencia, *Guerra de Granada*, 9.

28. Palencia, *Guerra de Granada*, 10.

29. Fernán Pérez de Guzmán, *Generaciones y semblanzas*, ed. José Antonio Barrio (Madrid: Cátedra, 1998), 166. For the translation, see Joseph O’Callaghan, *The Last Crusade in the West: Castile and the Conquest of Granada* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014), 229.

30. Arévalo, *Compendiosa historia hispánica*, 26-27. “Alfonso VI eundē Rodericū ad Regem Sibilie vassallū mitteret . ut solitum tributum reciperet . evenit ut Roderico morā apud Sibiliā trahere Rex Granate plurimis nobilibus Cristianis sociatus qui erant ab Hispania exules”.

did. Valera did the same. The very title of Valera's book, *La crónica de España abreviada por mandado dela serenissima e ilustrissima Señora doña Isabel Reyna de Castilla, etc.*, reflects the reality of distinct kingdoms in Iberia. Though Valera refers to the invading Moors of 711 as "enemies of the faith" (*enemigos de la fe*) and "barbarous and foreign peoples" (*bárbaros y gentes estrañas*)³¹, he nonetheless suggests that when Alfonso VI took Toledo in 1085, the Moors gave him the city "on the condition that they [the Moors] could remain as residents in their houses and properties"³². This situation, as Valera presented it, was perfectly acceptable.

Valera also preferred using the phrases "Christian king" or "Catholic kings" and "Moorish king", and distinguished between Iberian Moors and African Moors. During the reign of Fernando III of Castile-Léon (r. 1217-1252), King Alhamar [Muhammad ibn Nasr, r. 1232-1273] of Arjona "made himself a vassal" (*el rey Alhamar...se fizo su Vassallo*). "The Moorish king did homage" to Fernando (*Delo qual el rey moro le hizo omenaje*) wrote Valera. In return, Fernando made him king of Granada, suggesting Castilian dominion that included space for a Moorish presence. When Fernando left the south and returned to Toledo, he left several important men to hold "the land of the Moors to Seville" (*la tierra de los moros hasta Sevilla*)³³. Valera recognized the kings of Granada as Moorish kings as long as they paid their annual tax to the kings of Castile. When they failed to do so, as Yusuf I did in 1340, they delegitimized their rule³⁴. In narrating the campaigns of Alfonso XI (r. 1313-1350) in southern Iberia in the 1340s, Valera observed that after the king's victory at the battle of Tarifa, "Albohacen [Abu al-Hasan, sultan of Morocco] fled to Gibraltar and the king of Granada to Marbella. And the Christian kings returned to their realms"³⁵. Overlordship, or sovereignty, then, belonged to the Christian kings, but direct political rule of all Hispania was ambiguous.

Pulgar used either the aforementioned titles or "kings of Castile, Aragon, Sicily" and "king of Granada" in his manuscript *Historia de los Reyes Católicos*³⁶. When he reached 1482 and the beginning of the final war against Granada, Pulgar wrote that the Catholic kings knew they should never start a war unless they did so for reasons of faith or security. In the case of Granada, they wanted to

31. Valera, *Crónica de España*, f. 34r.

32. Valera, *Crónica de España*, f. 61r. "Con condicion que los moros quedassen por moradores enella en sus casas y heredades".

33. Valera, *Crónica de España*, f. 83r.

34. Valera, *Crónica de España*, f. 93r.

35. Valera, *Crónica de España*, f. 92r. "El qual (Albohacen) se fue fuyendo para Gibraltar, y el rey de Granada a Marbella. E los reyes cristianos se volvieron a sus reales".

36. Hernando de Pulgar, *Historia de los Reyes Católicos don Fernando y doña Isabel*, BNE MSS/1777, f. 133, 180. As part of the queen's entourage, Pulgar was present at several sieges during the war against Granada in the 1480s. For more, see Miguel Ángel Pérez Priego, "Caballeros y prelados biografiados por Fernando de Pulgar", in *La literatura en la Época de los Reyes Católicos*, 207-227.

remove the “lordship of Moors and the name of Mohammed” from all of “the Spains” (*lanzar de todas las Españas el señorío de los Moros y el nombre de Mahoma*)³⁷. But when the armies of Isabel and Ferdinand finally conquered Granada, Pulgar did not refer to Isabel as queen of Spain but as queen of Granada³⁸. He did the same in his brief biographies in *Claros Varones de España*. Enrique IV, he wrote, made several incursions into the “kingdom of Granada” (*en el reyno de Granada*), which resulted in the Granadan Moors having to pay him tribute (*parias*) to avoid war³⁹. In his chapter on Íñigo López de Mendoza, the marquis of Santillana, Pulgar wrote that Mendoza fought against Christians (the Aragonese) and Muslims, “the king of Granada and other captains of that kingdom” (*con el rey de Granada y con otros capitanes de aquel reyno*). Mendoza was so successful against Granada that he forced them to take “the yoke of servitude” and pay tribute to Enrique IV, who then used the tribute to ransom Christian captives⁴⁰. This was quite a feat because the Moors were “bellicose, astute, and treacherous in the arts of war, and robust and cruel men”. Pulgar’s description of Castile’s Moorish enemies served to make Mendoza’s victories in forcing vassalage and tribute on them that much greater⁴¹, while his use of titles other than “king [or queen] of Spain” left the Spanish kingdoms politically disunited, in that they did not form one nation, Hispania. Their only clear unity was in the person of the monarch. Arévalo’s, Valera’s, and Pulgar’s histories thus appears less overtly exclusionary than Palencia’s and Guzmán’s and suggest that perhaps Moors could live in Hispania with their own political community so long as they were a vassal or tributary of a Castilian Christian overlord.

For fifteenth-century historians and writers struggling to describe and define their community, there was tension between the Spains and the king of Spain (Kagan’s *pro patria* and *pro persona*) and that tension, especially with Valera and Arévalo but also with Pulgar, remained unresolved. Further, there was tension between a religious definition of community (Christians or Muslims) and a geo-political one (Spaniards, Goths, Granadans, etc.). All of these authors agreed that the Castilian-Leonese community, in much smaller form, and its political territory leadership existed prior to al-Andalus and therefore was the legitimate political community of Hispania. Most of them accepted the presence of Granada *de facto* but not *de jure*. Arévalo, Valera, and Pulgar suggest the possibility of a *de jure* Muslim political community under Castilian dominion; Palencia and Guzmán do not. These chroniclers sought to present their kingdom’s

37. Pulgar, *Historia de los Reyes Católicos*, f. 180.

38. Pulgar, *Historia de los Reyes Católicos*, f. 375.

39. Hernando de Pulgar, *Los Claros Varones de España*, ed. Joseph Abraham Levi (New York: Peter Lang, 1996), 8. See also Hernando de Pulgar, *Los Claros Varones de España* (Sevilla: Estanislao Polono, 1500), f. 5r.

40. Pulgar, *Los Claros Varones*, ed. Levi, 22-23. See also Pulgar, *Los Claros Varones* (1500), f. 12.

41. Pulgar, *Los Claros Varones*, ed. Levi, 60. See also Pulgar, *Los Claros Varones* (1500), f. 32.

control over Hispania as legitimate through possession of Toledo, through legal descent from a legitimate Gothic monarchy and through military conquest. Just as the Goths had permitted Romans to stay in Hispania after their conquest, and just as some Romans preferred to stay for personal, political, or financial reasons, so some later authors posited that Muslims could continue to live in Spain and in some cases exercise lordship, so long as they ultimately served a Castilian Christian monarch⁴². Perhaps the absence of a clear, straightforward answer to the question of the Moors' status in Iberia gave them (or, after 1492, Mudejars) greater flexibility with and room to assert themselves to Castilian kings, at least until the revolt of the Alpujarras in 1499, after which Isabel vigorously forced conversion on the Mudejars, who subsequently became known as Moriscos.

By the sixteenth century, the urgency to unite Spain in writing had diminished because Charles I (r. 1516-1556) claimed both Castile and Aragón in his person. Historians therefore did not press the Visigothic heritage as persistently, and one, Father Juan Baptista, even wrote a panegyric in praise of Abd al-Malik, the sultan of Morocco (r. 1576-1578) who died fighting the Portuguese⁴³. In addition, many Castilian historians, such as Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo, Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda, and Francisco López de Gómara, turned their attention to the peoples of the Americas instead of those in Iberia. Yet even though the reality of Moorish political power in Iberia receded, the problem of communal identity remained. More than five hundred years later, it continues to haunt and disturb Spain.

RESUMEN

La historia fue tan importante para la construcción de la identidad comunitaria y la legitimidad política en el siglo XV como lo es hoy, y en los reinos de España igualmente tenso. Los cronistas y biógrafos católicos castellanos parecen inseguros del estado preciso de los moros en Iberia. Todos estaban de acuerdo con el control político o el señorío de los cristianos castellanos, pero pocos tenían una idea clara de las implicaciones de ese señorío para los moros. ¿Debería permitirse a los moros permanecer como parte de la comunidad una vez que un monarca cristiano castellano tomara el control de su ciudad, región o reino, o no había posibilidad de que pertenecieran? Rodrigo Sánchez de Arévalo (1404-1470), Fernán Pérez de Guzmán (c. 1377-c. 1460), Alonso Fernández de Palencia (1423-1492), Hernando de Pulgar (1436-c. 1492), y Mosén Diego de

42. On Isidore's treatment of legitimate Gothic rule and the Roman remnants, see Wood, *The Politics of Identity*, 179-188.

43. Juan Baptista, *Crónica de la vida y admirables hechos de Muley Abd el Melech, emperador de Marruecos y rey de los reynos de Fez, Mequines y Sus, y del sucesso en la restauración de todos ellos, en prosa y verso* (Valencia: Andrea Gasparo-Corso, 1577).

Valera (1412-1488) dieron diferentes respuestas. Todos coincidieron en que la comunidad castellano-leonesa existía antes de al-Andalus y, por lo tanto, era la comunidad política legítima de Hispania. La mayoría de ellos aceptaron la presencia de Granada *de facto* pero no *de jure*. Sin embargo, Arévalo, Valera y Pulgar sugieren la posibilidad de una comunidad política musulmana *de jure* bajo dominio castellano; Palencia y Guzmán no.

Palabras clave: comunidad, identidad, legitimidad política, historias castellanas, siglo XV, moros.

ABSTRACT

History was as important to the construction of communal identity and political legitimacy in the fifteenth century as it is today, and in the kingdoms of Spain just as fraught. Catholic Castilian chroniclers and biographers often seemed unsure of the precise status of Spanish Muslims (Moors) in Iberia. All agreed with Castilian Christian political control or over-lordship, but few had a clear idea of the implications of that lordship for the Moors. Should Moors be allowed to remain as part of the community once a Castilian Christian monarch took control of their town, region, or kingdom, or was there no possibility of them belonging? Rodrigo Sánchez de Arévalo (1404-1470), Fernán Pérez de Guzmán (c. 1377-c. 1460), Alonso Fernández de Palencia (1423-1492), Hernando de Pulgar (1436-c. 1492), and Mosén Diego de Valera (1412-1488) gave different answers. All agreed that the Castilian-Leonese community existed prior to al-Andalus and therefore was the legitimate political community of Hispania. Most of them accepted the presence of Granada *de facto* but not *de jure*. However, Arévalo, Valera, and Pulgar suggest the possibility of a *de jure* Muslim political community under Castilian dominion; Palencia and Guzmán did not.

Key words: community, identity, political legitimacy, Castilian histories, fifteenth century, Moors.